



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,846	08/27/2001	Rebecca L. Poole	STL920000085US1	3150

22462 7590 08/13/2004

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

TANG, KUO LIANG J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/939,846

Applicant(s)

POOLE ET AL.

Examiner

Kuo-Liang J Tang

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/22/01.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 8/27/2001.

The priority date for this application is 8/27/2001.

Claims 1-15 are pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 10/22/2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to (Document No.: 2,191,640, Date: 11/29/96, Country: Canada) therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 4 objected to because of the following informalities: "The system of claim 1" should be "The system of claim 3". Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2122

4. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims (1, 5, 7-8) of co-pending Application No. 09/939,813 (hereinafter '813) respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following observation.

Instant Claim	'813 Claim
<p>1. A computer-implemented system of developing multi-tier business applications, comprising:</p> <p>an Integrated Development Environment (IDE), executed by a computer, for creating and maintaining a multi-tier business application on a multiple tier computer network, wherein the IDE includes a Topological Multi-Tier Business Application Composer that is used by a developer to graphically design, develop, maintain, build, test, debug, and deploy the multi-tier business application,</p>	<p>1. A computer-implemented system of developing multi-tier business applications, comprising:</p> <p>an Integrated Development Environment (IDE), executed by a computer, for creating and maintaining a multi-tier business application on a multiple tier computer network, wherein the IDE includes a Topological Multi-Tier Business Application Composer that is used by a developer to graphically design, develop, maintain, build, test, debug, and deploy the multi-tier business application,</p> <p>the Composer includes a window and a palette, and the palette contains graphical</p>

<p>a Meta-model that captures and persistently stores information entered via the Composer,</p> <p>and an Interactive Agent that monitors the Meta-model for an occurrence of one or more specific events, whereupon the Interactive Agent triggers a display of a graphical element in the Composer to interact with the developer, and the graphical element includes context information comprising a list of suggested and recommended actions.</p>	<p>constructs representing tiers and components of the tiers that are used to design, develop, maintain, build, test, debug, and deploy a graphical presentation of the multi-tier business application in the window.</p> <p>5. The system of claim 1, wherein the IDE further comprises</p> <p>a Meta-model that captures information entered via the Composer and that persistently stores the information.</p> <p>7. The system of claim 5, wherein the Meta-model is updated and kept in synchronization with any updates made to the multi-tier business application via the Composer.</p> <p>8. The system of claim 5, wherein the Meta-model is accessible by other tools.</p>
---	---

The limitations recited in claim 1 is obvious variations of limitation in '454 Claims 1, 5, 7-8.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sheard et al., US Patent No. 6,208,345 (hereinafter Sheard).

As Per Claim 1, Sheard teaches that a visual data integration system architecture and methodology is disclosed. The system architecture includes a transport framework that represents a technology-independent integration mechanism that facilitates the exchange of technology-dependent data between disparate applications. (E.g. see Abstract and associated text). In that Sheard discloses the method that covering the steps of:

“an Integrated Development Environment (IDE) (E.g. see col. 3:16-18, which states “A visual interface facilitates the design, deployment, and runtime monitoring of an integrated information system (IDE) implementation”), executed by a computer, for

Art Unit: 2122

creating and maintaining a multi-tier business application (E.g. see col. 3:24-26, which states “Various component icons may be packaged together in business extension modules (multi-tier business application) to provide users with specific business integration capabilities”) on a multiple tier computer network, wherein the IDE includes a Topological Multi-Tier Business Application Composer (E.g. see col. 24:55-67, which states “... in the presentation of a menu item ... provides a tree view of the network environment currently in operation...”) that is used by a developer to graphically design, develop, maintain, build, test, debug, and deploy (E.g. col. 6:11-13, which states “... facilitate the design, deployment, and runtime monitoring ...”) the multi-tier business application (E.g. col. 3:24-26),

“a Meta-model that captures and persistently stores information entered via the Composer” (E.g. see col. 23:41-45, which states “Confirming the integrity ... by comparing the meta-data models ...”; col. 29:32-36, which states “... a meta-model approach allows the validity of a data integration implementation to be verified, ...” and col. 29:51-61, which states “Storage of the meta-model is typically implemented using a file based approach ...”), and

“an Interactive Agent that monitors (E.g. see Fig. 17 and associated text) the Meta-model for an occurrence of one or more specific events, whereupon the Interactive Agent triggers a display of a graphical element in the Composer to interact with the developer, and the graphical element includes context information comprising a list of suggested and recommended actions (E.g. see Fig. 17, Xchange button 544 and associated text, e.g. see col. 19:51-63 which states “Activating the Xchange button 544

Art Unit: 2122

opens a pop-up menu of common system wide commands and configuration controls ...”).

As Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sheard teaches:

“wherein the Interactive Agent includes a Novice mode, and the Interactive Agent is triggered in the Novice Mode when an event occurs that is selected from a group comprising: opening a new window; (E.g. see col. 19:51-63 which states “...include the following activatable buttons: new, open, save, delete, and print...”) ...”;

As Per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sheard teaches:

“wherein the Interactive Agent includes an Advanced mode, and the Interactive Agent is triggered in the Advanced Mode when an event occurs (E.g. see col. 26:39-48, which states “...double clicking on a statistical analysis adapter...”) that comprises a possible non-optimization in a portion of the multi-tier business application (E.g. see Fig. 22 and associated text) based upon an heuristic analysis of the information (E.g. see col. 26:39-48) gathered by the Composer and stored within the Meta-model.”

As Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Chong teaches:

“wherein the possible non-optimization is determined by examining attributes (E.g. see col. 26:39-48, which states “...A configuration form is popped up requesting the

Art Unit: 2122

user for a display period, attribute name, and value list...) of the multi-tier business application stored within the Meta-model.”

As Per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Chong teaches:

“wherein the Meta-model is updated and kept in synchronization with any updates made to the multi tier business application via the Composer window.” (E.g. see col. 4:22-30, which states “...the data exchange infrastructure effects a rollback of failed transactions to preclude the loss of data ...”).

As Per Claim 6, is the method claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per Claims 7-10, the rejection of claim 6 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 2-5 respectfully.

As Per Claim 11, is the manufacture claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per Claims 12-15, the rejection of claim 6 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 2-5 respectfully.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is 703-305-4866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuo-Liang J. Tang

Software Engineer Patent Examiner



WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER